

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated July 23, 2009, is respectfully requested in view of this amendment. By this amendment, claims 2, 3, 6 and 9 have been amended.

Claims 2 and 9 have been made dependent from claims 1 and 15, respectively. Claim 3 has been amended to recite descriptions of a distance from at least one bobbin edge of the thread layers fluctuating in distance relative to a distance from at least one bobbin edge of an adjacent thread layer. Support for this description is found in the specification, *inter alia*, at Paragraph [0020]. The amendment to claim 6 corrects an error in formatting.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments introduce no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132, and the scope of claims 1 and 3 was not altered or reduced by this amendment.

This amendment is not believed to raise new issues for search or consideration by the Examiner.

In the outstanding Office Action, Examiner objected to claim 3 and rejected claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0161979 to Koyanagi et al. It is believed that the above amendments fully overcome the objection and the rejections.

Objections to Claims 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended to distance from at least one bobbin edge of the thread layers fluctuating in distance relative to a distance from at least one bobbin edge of an adjacent thread layer. These elements are described in the specification, *inter alia*, at Paragraphs [0017] and [0020].

Accordingly, the objection to claim 3 is believed to be overcome.

Rejections of Claims 2 and 9 under 35 USC §102

Applicants have made claims 2 and 9 dependent from allowed claims 1 and 15, respectively. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are believed to be overcome.

Allowed Claims

The Examiner indicated that claims 1, 4-7 and 10-15 are allowed and claim 3 is not rejected over the cited art. Applicants appreciate this determination of allowability.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
THE NATH LAW GROUP

October 23, 2009

THE NATH LAW GROUP
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891
Tel: 703-548-6284
Fax: 703-683-8396



Jerald L. Meyer
Registration No. 41,194
Derek Richmond
Registration No. 45,771
Stanley N. Protigal
Registration No. 28,657
Customer No. 20529